

**REMARKS**

This amendment is being submitted in connection with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 35-37 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 35-37 to choose language from the Specification (Pages 18 and 22).

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-20, 27-34, and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Schneider in view of Sato and further in view of Masson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The references alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest generating different voice instructions of different types *during a transaction with a customer* based upon proper, improper, or untimely responses from the customer as the customer uses a retail terminal.

Schneider distinguishes computer generated voice signals from computer generated tonalities (Col 6, lines 56-59). Therefore, Schneider fails to teach or suggest generating second or third voice instructions as claimed.

There is no teaching or suggestion to combine the teachings of Sato and Masson with those of Schneider to accomplish the claimed invention. Sato and Masson are not concerned with customer interactions with a retail terminal that may lead to theft.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Schneider in view of Sato. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted above, Schneider fails to teach or suggest generating a second voice instruction as claimed.

There is no teaching or suggestion to combine the teachings of Sato with those of Schneider to accomplish the claimed invention. Sato is not concerned with customer interactions with a retail terminal that may lead to theft.

Specifically, the references fail to teach or suggest:

if said self-service customer fails to perform the task, generating a second voice instruction in a second voice type by said retail terminal, wherein the second voice type is different than the first voice type and conveys an impression of seriousness to the self-service customer.

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks,  
Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17,  
19-20, and 27-37 are in condition for allowance. Action to  
that end is hereby solicited.



Paul W. Martin  
Attorney for Applicant  
Phone: (937) 445-2990

Dayton, OH

JAN 13 2005